

Shakespeariana

VOL. VI.

MARCH, 1889.

NO. LXIII.

THE SONNETS.*

HAT we really know about the *Sonnets* from external evidence can be stated in a few sentences. They are first mentioned by Francis Meres in his often-quoted tribute to Shakespeare, published in 1598. He compares the poet to Ovid, and adds: "Witness his *Venus and Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred Sonnets among his private friends, etc." The next year (1599) we find two of the Sonnets (138 and 144) printed by the piratical Jaggard in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, together with Longaville's sonnet in *Love's Labour's Lost*, "Did not the heavenly rhetoric of thine eye," etc. We do not know that any of the others were printed until 1609, when the entire series was brought out by one Thomas Thorpe, who tells us on his title-page that the poems were "never before imprinted." No second edition of the volume seems to have been called for; and no complete reprint of the Sonnets appeared until 1709, just a hundred years later, when they were included in Lintott's collected edition of Shakespeare's *Poems*. All but eight of them, however, had been printed in 1640 (twenty-four years after Shakespeare's death), in a volume entitled "*Poems: Written by Wil. Shakespeare*," which also contains the pieces in the *Passionate Pilgrim*, *A Lover's Complaint*, and sundry poems that are evidently spurious, like the majority of those in the *Passionate Pilgrim*. The Sonnets are here re-arranged under various titles, with the other poems sandwiched between the groups.

* Read before the New York Shakespeare Society, Feb. 25, 1887.

So much for facts about which there is no dispute; and now for a few of the most important questions concerning these poems over which editors, commentators, and critics have wrangled, and over some of which they will doubtless continue to wrangle to the last syllable of recorded time.

Was the edition of 1609 authorized or supervised by Shakespeare? So far as we know, the *Venus and Adonis* and the *Lucrece* are the only works that he himself ever published or saw through the press. They both contain formal dedications signed with his name, are carefully printed for that day, and the *Lucrece* at least, as the variations in different copies of the first edition clearly prove, was corrected by the author while on the press. The volume of *Sonnets* contains a dedication, but it is signed by the publisher, not the author, and the book abounds in errors of the type, most of which Shakespeare could not have failed to detect if he had supervised the printing. He was pretty certainly in London in 1609, and if he allowed these "sugred Sonnets" to be printed at all, he would surely have seen that they were printed well.

To my thinking, the question is settled by one little peculiarity in the printing of the 126th Sonnet, if sonnet it may be called. It has only twelve lines, and our friend Thorpe, assuming that a couplet had been lost, completed the normal fourteen lines by *two blank ones* enclosed in marks of parenthesis. Shakespeare could not have done this, and Thorpe would not have done it if he had been in communication with Shakespeare. In that case, he would have asked the poet for the couplet he supposed to be missing, and William would probably have told him that nothing was missing. The piece is not an imperfect sonnet of Shakespeare's pattern, but is made of six rhymed couplets, and the sense is apparently complete. No critic, so far as I am aware, has noted the significance of this little typographical fact, and it did not occur to me until I was preparing to write this paper.

Now, if Shakespeare had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with the publication of the Sonnets by Thorpe, the fact has some important bearings, as we shall see further on.

To whom is the *Dedication* addressed, and what does it mean? It reads thus:

TO · THE · ONLIE · BEGETTER · OF ·
THESE · IN SVING · SONNETS ·
Mr. W. H. ALL · HAPPINESSE ·
AND · THAT · ETERNITIE ·
PROMISED ·
BY ·
OVR · EVER-LIVING · POET ·
WISHETH ·
THE · WELL-WISHING ·
ADVENTVRER · IN ·
SETTING ·
FORTH ·

T. T.

If Shakespeare had nothing to do with Thorpe's venture, the dedication is Thorpe's own, as it purports to be. But in what sense was "Mr. W. H.," whoever he may have been, "the onlie begetter" of the Sonnets? *Begetter* may mean either the person to whom the Sonnets owed their birth, or the one who got them together for publication—the person to whom they were originally addressed, or the one who collected and arranged them for Thorpe. The majority of critics take the word in the former and more familiar sense, while the minority cite examples of the other meaning from writers of the time, and argue plausibly for its adoption here. Both explanations have their difficulties, and it is not easy to decide between them. When I was editing the Sonnets, I was inclined to the second—taking *begetter* as equivalent to collector—but further study has led me to favor the other and simpler interpretation. The change does not in the slightest degree affect the opinions I have expressed as to the origin, the order, or the significance of the Sonnets. Who Mr. W. H. was, we shall probably never know; but if he was not

the editor of the Sonnets, they *had* an editor about whom we know neither more nor less than about Mr. W. H.—not even less by the initials of his name, for whether the letters W. H. are the initials of a real name is a disputed point; there be those who think them a misprint for W. S., or a transposition of H. W., or letters taken at random as a mere “blind.”

The vital question concerning this unknown editor is whether he was in the confidence of either the writer of the Sonnets or the person or persons to or for whom they were written. If he was not, his arrangement of the Sonnets is not an authoritative one; and that he was not is evident from the fact that he did not, and presumably could not, ask either the author or the addressee of the 126th Sonnet for that supposed lost couplet. His leaving that poem incomplete, as he believed it to be, simply confirms the opinion I expressed in my edition of the Sonnets, that he collected the Sonnets, and arranged them for the press as well as he could from what he knew of their history and from a study of the poems themselves. As I have said in my preface, “He seems to have known enough of their origin and their meaning to enable him to get them *nearly* in their proper order; but I suspect that if Shakespeare had read the proof-sheets, he might have made some transpositions.” But before looking critically at the arrangement of the Sonnets, let us briefly consider the question whether they are autobiographical or not, *the* question to which all others relating to them are secondary and subordinate.

For myself, I firmly believe that the great majority of the Sonnets, to quote what Wordsworth says, “express Shakespeare’s own feelings in his own person.” I had often read and heartily loved the poems before I came to this conclusion; indeed, it was not until I carefully *studied* them with a view to editing them that I was fully converted to this view. It never occurred to me until now to reckon up the authorities on the two sides of the question. I had an impression that the majority favored the “personal” theory; but I am surprised to find it an overwhelming majority. Among the *poets* on this side are Words-

worth, Coleridge, Sir Henry Taylor, Swinburne, Rossetti, and Victor Hugo. To these should be added Shelley, if I read aright a reference to the Sonnets in one of his poems, and Tennyson, if I may depend on what one of his friends has told me. On the other side I know of no poets but Browning (who, quoting Wordsworth's sonnet on the Sonnet, "with this same key Shakespeare unlock'd his heart," adds "Did Shakespeare? If so, the less Shakespeare he!") and our own Stoddard. Of editors and critics, the chief who are on the "personal" side are Malone, Farmer, Tyrwhitt, Steevens, Drake, Hallam, Boaden, Armitage Brown, Knight, Collier, Furnivall, Trench, Dowden (the last last two both critics and poets), Palgrave, and Minto (who, however, excepts the Sonnets after the 126th); and to these are opposed only Staunton, Bolton Corney, Halliwell-Phillipps, Grant White, and Hudson. Among the Germans on the one side are Ulrici, Gervinus, Kreyssig, Hermann Isaac, and Sievers; and on the other Delius and Karl Elze. In this enumeration I do not include writers who, like Gerald Massey, hold certain mixed or muddled views, nor the out-and-out "cranks," like the German Barnstorff, who takes W. H. to be "William Himself," and tells us that the poet in the Sonnets appeals from his mortal to his immortal part, and all that, or those who believe that he addresses the Spirit of Beauty or the Divine Logos, or Queen Elizabeth, or his own son—but not by Anne Hathaway—or who think that his dark mistress is "Dramatic Art, or the Catholic Church, or the Bride of the Canticles, black but comely." In a brief paper like this, one must not give much space to "the pranks of Puck among the critics," as Dowden calls them, laughable though they may be.

If the Sonnets are not of this personal character, are they mere exercises of the fancy, "the free outcome of a poetic imagination," as Delius phrases it? This theory is easy and specious at first, but lands us at last among worse perplexities than it evades. That Shakespeare, for example, should write seventeen sonnets urging a young man to marry and perpetuate his family is strange enough, but that he should select such a

theme as a fictitious basis for seventeen sonnets is stranger yet, and the same may be said of the story or stories underlying other of the poems. Some critics, indeed, who take them to be thus artificially inspired, have been compelled to regard them as *satirical*—intended to ridicule the sonneteers of the time, especially Drayton and Sir John Davies of Hereford. Others, like Professor Minto, who believe the first 126 to be personal and serious, regard the rest as “exercises of skill undertaken in a spirit of wanton defiance and derision of commonplace;” but only a critic hard pushed by his theory could detect irony where it had passed unsuspected from Shakespeare’s time to ours. No unbiased and fair-minded reader could see anything of the sort. “The poems,” to quote Dowden again, “are in the taste of the time; less extravagant and less full of conceits than many other Elizabethan collections, more distinguished by exquisite imagination and all that betokens genuine feeling; they are, as far as manner goes, such sonnets as Daniel might have chosen to write if he had had the imagination and the heart of Shakespeare. All that is quaint or contorted or ‘conceited’ in them can be paralleled from passages of early plays of Shakespeare, such as *Romeo and Juliet* and the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, where assuredly no satirical intention is discoverable.”

If the Sonnets had been mere poetical exercises, it is passing strange that Shakespeare should not have published them ten years before they were brought out by the pirate Thorpe. He must have written them for publication if that was their character, and the extraordinary popularity of his earlier poems would have insured them a favorable reception with the public. It was, indeed, the success of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*—the 4th edition of the former being issued in 1599, and the second of the latter in 1598—which prompted Jaggard to compile the *Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599. It is a significant fact that he was able to rake together only ten poems which can possibly be Shakespeare’s, and three of these were from *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. To these ten pieces he added ten* others, which he im-

* Eleven, as ordinarily printed in editions of Shakespeare; but the two little pieces beginning “Good-night, good rest,” and “Lord, how

pudently called Shakespeare's, though we know that most of them were stolen, and can trace some of them to their authors.

Some sensitive souls are no doubt led to regard the Sonnets as impersonal, because they are not willing to believe that Shakespeare, with a wife and family at Stratford, could have been involved in an intrigue with a married woman in London. His admirers, as Furnivall remarks, "are so anxious to remove every stain from him that they contend for a non-natural interpretation of his poems. . . . They forget Shakespeare's impulsive nature and his long absence from home. They will not face the probabilities of the case, or recollect that David was still God's friend, though Bathsheba lived. The Sonnets are in one sense Shakespeare's Psalms. Spiritual struggles underlie both poets' work."

For myself, I could as soon believe the Penitential Psalms of David to be purely rhetorical and fictitious as the 129th Sonnet, than which no more remorseful utterance was ever wrung from a soul that had tasted the ashes to which the Sodom apples of illicit love are turned in the end :

The expense of spirit in a waste of shame,
Is lust in action ; and till action lust
Is perjur'd, murderous, bloody, full of blame,
Savage, extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust,
Enjoy'd no sooner but despised straight,
Past reason hunted, and no sooner had
Past reason hated, as a swallow'd bait
On purpose laid to make the taker mad ;
Mad in pursuit, and in possession so ;
Had, having, and in quest to have, extreme ;
Before, a joy propos'd ; behind, a dream.
All this the world well knows ; yet none knows well
To shun the heaven that leads unto this hell.

Have we here nothing but the "admirable fooling" of the actor masquerading in the garb of the penitent, or the satirist

mine eyes throw gazes to the East!" are parts of one and the same poem. Dowden (introduction to the Griggs fac-simile of the 1799 ed. of the *Passionate Pilgrim*) was the first to suspect this ; and I have proved it beyond a doubt (see my ed. of *Venus and Adonis*, etc., as *revised*) by certain peculiarities in the typography of the 1599 edition.

mimicking the conceits and affectations of the rhymers of the time? If you take this to be the counterfeit of feeling, I can only exclaim with Leonato in *Much Ado*: "O God, counterfeit! There was never counterfeit of passion came so near the life of passion!"

I yield to no one in my exalted estimate of Shakespeare as a man—but he *was a man*, with all the frailties and infirmities of our poor human nature. He was not of the type of men described in the 94th Sonnet,

"Who, moving others, are themselves as stone,
Unmoved, cold, and to temptation slow."

But if, like David, he sinned, and sinned greatly—and yet not so darkly as that royal poet of old—like him he repented in dust and ashes; and all that we know of his after life proves that he was wiser, stronger, better for that discipline of sin and suffering and repentance. I see evidence of this in the plays as clearly as in the Sonnets. Shakespeare may be the most impersonal of dramatists, but even as a dramatist "the man" is to be seen in "the book," and it is the same man that we see in the Sonnets.

I wanted to refer somewhat in detail to these indications of "Shakespeare the man" that we have in the Sonnets as in the plays—the high ideal of friendship, for instance—only what we might expect of the creator of Antonio and Bassanio, Brutus and Cassius, Hamlet and Horatio—delineations of manly friendship, perhaps unsurpassed by any that he has given us of the love of man and woman; but I must leave the reader to follow out this line of thought for himself.

I have said that I regard the great majority of the Sonnets as personal. And why not agree with those who suppose the first 126 to be all addressed to the same person, and that person a man? Because this is unlikely on the face of it, as well as from the circumstances of their collection and publication. The last two Sonnets are evidently mere poetical exercises, and probably belong to the period of the composition of *Venus and Adonis*, as their subject suggests. The editor of 1609 put them at the end because he could not find any other good place for

them ; and I strongly suspect it was for a similar reason that he put the Sonnets following the 126th where he did. He knew that Shakespeare had addressed many of his sonnets to his friend, Mr. W. H., and he included in the group ending with the 126th all that he could possibly force into it. At a time when one man could write verses to another in a strain such as now he would use only in writing to a woman with whom he is in love, it was easy to confound poems addressed to a wife or mistress with those addressed to a male friend. May not the early editor have done this, as many editors and critics have followed him in doing ?

For myself, I am inclined to agree with those, including our own White and Hudson, who believe that certain of the Sonnets were addressed to Ann Hathaway [97-99, 111, etc.]. There are others among the first 126 which may or may not belong in the series ; there is really no internal evidence to settle the question either way. Our editor gave them the benefit of the doubt, and counted them in ; he had no better *authority* for doing so than any of his successors.

Is it probable on the face of it that all these 154 Sonnets (or all but two) are either addressed to one person or connected with the poet's relations to that person and one other—the woman with whom they both were entangled ? Is it not probable that a poet who " unlocked his heart " to such an extent in this form of verse would occasionally, if not often, have employed it in expressing his feelings towards other friends or with reference to other experiences ? Is it likely that the Sonnet in *Love's Labour's Lost* is his one effort in this line outside of this great series ? I, for one, cannot believe it.

But I must hurry on to a very brief consideration of one or two more questions concerning the Sonnets. When were they written ? We have seen that Meres refers to them in 1598 in a manner which implies that though unpublished they were well-known among the poet's private friends (and this, by the by, would suggest that they were addressed to more than one or two of those friends), and in 1599 two of them were printed by the pirate Jaggard.

Note that one of these, the 144th, is not only one of the last in the series as arranged in 1609, but it has been called the *key of* the series, and helps us fix the date of all the Sonnets connected with the loves of the poet and his friend for the dark lady. It is a summary of that painful story in fourteen lines, and proves that the story ends by 1599, or when Shakespeare was thirty-five years old—just when the chronology of the plays, if we are to see the man in them, would indicate—the time of the transition from the joyous and sunny comedies (*As You Like It, Much Ado, and Twelfth Night*) to those that show a growing bitterness of spirit (*All's Well, Measure for Measure*, and *Troilus and Cressida*). The sin and abasement of Angelo, the wantonness and infidelity of Cressida, might not have been held up to the scorn and pity of the ages if Shakespeare had never known that “woman coloured ill” who became for a season his “worser spirit.”

All the Sonnets must, of course, have been written before 1609, and if we assume them to be all connected with a single friendship and a single intrigue, all or nearly all must have been written before 1599. As I have said, some of them are not thus connected, and the date of these we have no sure means of fixing.

I may remark incidentally here that critics in their theories of the Sonnets have more than once stultified themselves by not attending to this matter of the dates. We cannot waste much time on these fooleries, but I may mention that some have labored to prove that Mr. W. H. was the poet's nephew, William Hart, who was not born until the year after the sonnets in the *Passionate Pilgrim* were printed, and was only nine years old when the whole collection was published. Again, the theory—otherwise, perhaps, the most plausible, where none is at all satisfactory—that W. H. was William Herbert, is vitiated by the fact that if the Sonnets are in the proper order, and the first seventeen were written first, this earnest and long-drawn appeal to the youth to marry must have been addressed to him when he was at most eighteen years old.

This question of the *order* of the Sonnets, to which casual al-

lusion has already been made, deserves fuller and more formal consideration than I can attempt to give it here. Some of those who, like Furnivall and Dowden, believe that either the first 126 or the entire 154 are arranged in the proper order, are extremely ingenious in explaining the sequence; but the more I study their elaborate schemes, the more I find myself compelled to distrust them. As I said in the early part of this paper, I give the editor of 1609 credit for arranging his material as well as a person could be expected to do who was not in the confidence of the author. He had, perhaps, seen some of the "sugred Sonnets" among the poet's friends, and had taken a fancy to make a collection of them. In the course of the ten years or more previous to 1609, he had gathered in the 154, which he sorted and arranged for publication as best he could. Those urging a friend to marry were easily picked out, and this group of seventeen, as the largest—or, possibly, as that in which the interconnection would be most obvious to the average reader—he placed first. As to the arrangement of the other groups he had made, he doubtless had his own little theory, based, we may suppose, on facts better known or more accessible then than now; but he had not *all* the information he needed for doing the work with thorough accuracy. After arranging the first 126, or all that he regarded as addressed to Mr. W. H. or the poet's male friend, he appended those written to the dark lady—perhaps, as I have said above, without any attempt at regular order—and, having added the two Cupid sonnets, handed over the whole to Thorpe for printing.

If I had more time I might call attention to some cases in which this editor of 1609 was almost certainly wrong in his arrangement. I will give only one as a sample. The 70th Sonnet is unquestionably out of place if it is addressed to the same person as the 34th, 35th, 40th, 41st, and 42d. All those refer to the sin and shame of his friend, and it is very clear what the sin was; but the 70th says:

For canker vice the sweetest buds doth love,
And thou present'st *a pure unstained prime*.
Thou hast past by the ambush of young days,
Either not assail'd or victor being charg'd.

Further on, in the 92d-96th Sonnets, we have the vice and shame of his friend again referred to, and these sonnets seem to belong to the same group with the earlier ones (34th, etc.) that I have named. The 70th, if it is addressed to the same person, ought to precede this group, instead of being between the two halves of it. Both Furnivall and Dowden fail to explain this 70th Sonnet satisfactorily, and I defy any defender of the present arrangement to clear up the difficulty.

Lest I be suspected of being unfair to Furnivall and Dowden, let us see just what they have to say upon this 70th Sonnet. Furnivall's comment, in his analysis of Sonnets 66-70, is this : "Will has mixed with bad company ; but Shakespeare is sure he is pure, and excuses him." At this stage of the friendship, then, Shakespeare is *sure* that his young friend is *pure*; but in the analysis of Sonnets 33-35 we read : "Will's sensual fault, blamed, repented, and forgiven ;" and this "fault," as the context explains, is taking away Shakespeare's mistress. What shall we say of critical analysis like this ? Yet no other exegesis is possible than this which Furnivall thus concisely summarizes. As I have said, there can be no doubt as to the fact and the nature of the sin mourned and condemned in the earlier Sonnets ; nor can there be any question that the later Sonnet congratulates the youth to whom it is addressed, not on having repented after yielding to temptation, but on having either escaped or resisted temptation. If this young man and the other young man are one and the same, as Furnivall assumes, the Sonnets cannot be in chronological order.

Dowden, in like manner, infers from the earlier Sonnets that Will has been "false to friendship," and that the only excuse Shakespeare can offer for him is that "he is but a boy whom a woman has beguiled ;" but in 70 the poet says the charges of loose living brought against his friend "must be slanders." Dowden cannot mean that this Sonnet is a friendly attempt to apologize for Will's disgrace after the poet has forgiven the wrong done to himself. We have that sort of thing in Sonnets 35, 36, 40, 41, and 42, where Elizabethan conceits are racked to the uttermost to excuse both his friend and his mistress for

playing him false; but the language and tone of 70 are direct and unmistakable. His friend is pure, though he cannot escape the attacks of slander: he is "unstained," though envy would fain besmirch him.

One broken link spoils the chain; and if this one sonnet can be proved to be out of place, the chronological theory falls to the ground. It would be easy to cite other instances of the same kind, but my limits permit me to give only one, and one is enough.

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that the Sonnets are in their right order, we encounter difficulties of another sort, but no less serious. Sonnets 138 and 144 were printed in 1599. The first 144, then, must have been written before 1599, when Shakespeare was thirty-five. Sonnet 104 implies that the preceding ones were written at least three years earlier, or when he was only thirty-two. How then are we to explain a Sonnet like 73, in which he speaks of himself as long past the prime of manhood? I am aware that this question has been more than once raised in connection with the 138th Sonnet, published in 1599, when Shakespeare was thirty-five, but in which he speaks of himself as "old" and his days "past the best." I know, too, how the question has been answered. We are told that here, as in some of the earlier Sonnets, he is contrasting himself, as a mature and experienced man, with a green youth perhaps not more than twenty. In the 2d Sonnet, writing to this same youth, he tells him that at "forty" he will be old, with "deep trenches" furrowed in his brow and his blood "cold" with age. But forty is not thirty-five, and thirty-five is not thirty-two, when, according to the chronology of the commentators who believe the Sonnets to be both personal and in the right order, this 73d was written. And this sonnet, be it noted, is in no respect a contrast of his own age with that of his young friend, but a long-drawn and apparently heartfelt lament that his life has fallen into the sear and yellow leaf:

That time of year thou mayst in me behold

When yellow leaves, or none or few, do hang

Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,

Bare ruin'd choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.

In me thou seest the twilight of such day
As after sunset fadeth in the west,
Which by and by black night doth take away,
Death's second self, that seals up all in rest.
In me thou seest the glowing of such fire
That on the ashes of his youth doth lie,
As the death-bed whereon it must expire,
Consum'd with that which it was nourish'd by.
This thou perceiv'st, which makes thy love more strong,
To love that well which thou must leave ere long.

Can we imagine a man of thirty-two writing thus of himself in all seriousness? Could this have been written by Shakespeare even at thirty-five? Does it not smack of 1609 rather than of 1599? It is one of a group of singularly despondent Sonnets, which it is hard to think of as belonging to the same period with the sunniest of the comedies, *Twelfth Night*, *Much Ado*, and *As You Like It*. In Sonnet 66 he is tired of life, and "cries for restful death;" in 71 and 72 he looks forward to death, and bids his friend not to mourn for him: and all this at the age of thirty-two or thirty-five, we are told. His despondency cannot be due to his relations with his friend, for there is positive evidence to the contrary in the poems themselves; and that 70th Sonnet, which expresses such absolute confidence in the purity of the young man, is set in the very midst of this group of despairful utterances.

As to the *authenticity* of the Sonnets, with possibly the exception of the 145th (which is in octosyllabic measure, and has no clear Shakespearian mark upon it) there can be no doubt. I have already said that "Shakespeare the Man" as seen in these poems is the same Shakespeare of whom we get glimpses, if no more, in the plays; and all the evidence of metre and style points in the same direction. Some of the more "cranky" interpreters (God save the mark!) have suggested that certain of the Sonnets were written by Southampton, or whoever "Mr. W. H." may have been; and two at least of the Baconian heretics, on opposite sides of the planet—one Caldwell in Australia in 1877, and Mr. W. D. O'Connor lately in this country—have ascribed them all to Sir Walter Raleigh..

The notion that the Sonnets could have been written by any other man than the author of the plays and other poems ascribed to Shakespeare, is hardly worthy of serious consideration. I may, however, refer briefly to a few out of many allusions, figures, peculiar uses of words, etc., which are identical in the Sonnets and in these other works, and which cannot be merely accidental coincidences.

Legal allusions, for instance, abound in the Sonnets as in the plays and other poems. See Sonnets 13, 30, 46 (where we have legal phraseology throughout), 74, 87, 107, 126, 134, 137, 142, etc. A glance at the notes of my edition of the *Sonnets* will show how closely the passages are paralleled in the poet's other compositions. It would take too much space to illustrate this in detail here.

We recognize also the same *love of music* in the two classes of works. Compare Sonnet 8 (perhaps the most exquisite tribute to music that Shakespeare ever wrote) with the familiar passages in the *Merchant* (v. 1. 54-88) and *Twelfth Night* (i. 1. 1 fol.). See also the pretty and playful Sonnet 128.

The poet's antipathy to *false hair* and *painting* in women appears in the Sonnets as in the plays, and in curiously similar forms. Read Sonnet 68 :

Thus is his cheek the map of days outworn,
When beauty liv'd and died as flowers do now,
Before these bastard signs of fair were born,
Or durst inhabit on a living brow;
Before the *golden tresses of the dead*,
The right of sepulchres, were shorn away,
To live a second life on *second head* ;
Ere *beauty's dead fleece* made another gay :
In him those holy antique hours are seen,
Without all ornament, itself and true,
Making no summer of another's green,
Robbing no old to dress his beauty new ;
And him as for a map doth Nature store,
To show false Art what beauty was of yore.

Compare this with the *Merchant*, iii. 2. 92 :

So are those crisped snaky golden locks,
Which make such wanton gambols with the wind.

Upon supposed fairness, often known
To be the dowry of a *second head*,
The skull that bred them in the sepulchre.

In *Timon of Athens*, iv. 3. 144, we find the same suggestion that it may be a dead woman's hair with which the living one tricks herself out :

Thatch your poor thin roofs
With burdens of *the dead*.

Again in *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. 3. 258, Biron says :

O, if in black my lady's brows be deck'd,
It mourns that *painting* and *usurping hair*
Should ravish doters with a false aspect.

In Sonnet 20, the poet's "master-mistress" has "a woman's face *with Nature's own hand painted*." In *Twelfth Night* (i. 5. 254 fol.) the disguised Viola says to the veiled Olivia, "Let me see your face;" and the Countess replies, "We will draw the curtain and show you the picture." Then follows this dialogue :

Viola. Excellently done, if God did all.

Olivia. 'Tis in grain, sir; 't will endure wind and weather.

Viola. 'Tis beauty truly blent, whose red and white
Nature's own sweet and cunning hand laid on.

It was a fancy of Shakespeare's that the peculiar charm of the rose was its fragrance rather than its beauty, and that its ideal destiny was to have this fragrance distilled and preserved after the beauty was gone. This is exquisitely set forth in Sonnet 54 :

O, how much more doth beauty beauteous seem
By that sweet ornament which truth doth give!
The rose looks fair, but *fairer we it deem*
For that sweet odour which doth in it live.
The canker-blooms have full as deep a dye
As the perfumed tincture of the roses,
Hang on such thorns, and play as wantonly
When summer's breath their masked buds discloses;

But, for their virtue only is their show,
They live unwoo'd and unrespected fade,
Die to themselves. *Sweet roses do not so;*
Of their sweet deaths are sweetest odours made;
And so of you, beauteous and lovely youth,
When that shall vade, my verse distills your truth.

Compare Sonnet 5. 5 fol.:

For never-resting time leads summer on
To hideous winter and confounds him there;
Sap check'd with frost and lusty leaves quite gone,
Beauty o'ersnow'd and bareness everywhere:
Then, *were not summer's distillation left,*
A liquid prisoner pent in walls of glass,
Beauty's effect with beauty were bereft,
Nor it nor no remembrance what it was:
But *flowers distill'd, though they with winter meet,*
Leese but their show; their substance still lives sweet.

Note the singularly close parallel to these passages in *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, i. 1. 76 fol.:

But *earthlier happy is the rose distill'd*
Than that which withering on the virgin thorn
Grows, lives, and dies in single blessedness.

And for the contemptuous reference to the "canker-blooms," or wild roses, compare *Much Ado*, i. 3. 28: "I had rather be a canker in a hedge than a rose in his grace;" and 1 *Henry IV*. i. 3. 76:

To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,
And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke.

The allusions to the encroachments of the sea on the land in Sonnet 64 and 2 *Henry IV*. iii. 1. 45 fol. are strikingly similar. The former reads thus:

When I have seen the hungry ocean gain
Advantage on the kingdom of the shore,
And the firm soil win of the watery main,
Increasing store with loss and loss with store—
When I have seen such interchange of state,
Or state itself confounded to decay,
Ruin hath taught me thus to ruminate,
That Time will come and take my love away.

King Henry exclaims :

O God ! that one might read the book of fate,
And see the revolution of the times
Make mountains level, and the continent,
Weary of solid firmness, melt itself
Into the sea ! and, other times, to see
The beachy girdle of the ocean
Too wide for Neptune's hips.

Critics have wondered that Shakespeare should know anything of these phenomena, and we do not find allusions to them in other poets of the time.

Of peculiar uses of words in the Sonnets and the plays scores of examples might be cited ; but a few must serve here as samples. We find *expiate* with the anomalous sense of "bring to an end" in the only two instances in which Shakespeare uses it—in Sonnet 22. 4: "Then look I death my days should expiate ;" and *Richard III.*, iii. 2. 23 : "Make haste ; the hour of death is expiate." *Dateless* means "endless, eternal" in the four passages in which it occurs—two in the plays (*Richard II.* i. 3. 151, *Romeo and Juliet*, v. 3. 115) and two in the Sonnets (30. 6 and 153. 6). The novel use of *sympathized* (described sympathetically, or with true appreciation) in Sonnet 82.11 is matched by that in *Lucrece*, 1113. The unusual expression "advised respects" (deliberate consideration) occurs in Sonnet 49. 4 and *King John*, iv. 2. 214 ; and the compound adjective "world-without-end" (apparently Shakespeare's coinage) in Sonnet 57.5 and *Love's Labour's Lost*, v. 2. 799.

But we must not go on with these "parallelisms." On the whole, if Sir Walter Raleigh wrote the Sonnets, I do not see how we can allow Bacon the credit of the plays.

If the limits of this paper allowed, it would be interesting to consider the Sonnets as *poems*—to note the "linked sweetness long drawn out" of their verse, not unmixed with more sonorous music, and what Coleridge has aptly called their "boundless fertility and labored condensation of thought ;" but as it is, I can only close with a summing up of what I have attempted to prove :

1st. That the Sonnets were not edited by Shakespeare, but by some anonymous collector who did not, and presumably could not, ask the poet or the persons to whom they were addressed for aid in settling a textual question.

2d. That the arrangement of the Sonnets in the edition of 1609 was therefore not authoritative, but simply the best conjectural one that the collector could make from a study of the poems and what he knew of their history ; and there is, moreover, internal evidence that the order is not strictly chronological.

3d. That the great majority of the Sonnets are personal or autobiographical, and were not intended for publication ; but it is not probable that the first 126 (or such of these as are personal) are all addressed to one man, and the rest to one woman, with whom Shakespeare and that man were both entangled.

4th. That, in whatever sense "Mr. W. H." may have been the "begetter" of the Sonnets, all the attempts to identify him have been unsuccessful, and some of them ridiculous.

5th. That, while the majority of the Sonnets were probably written before 1599, some of them may be of later date, especially those in which the poet refers to himself as old and tired of life.

Finally, that while some of the more important questions concerning the Sonnets may be settled, others are likely to remain among the insoluble problems of literature.

WILLIAM J. ROLFE.

"THE TITUS ANDRONICUS:" WAS IT SHAKESPEARE'S FIRST PLAY? HOW WAS IT MOUNTED ON THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE? DID IT MEET WITH FAVOR FROM THEATRE-GOERS?

(Continued from January number.)



THE three kinds of popular shows—the Miracle Play, the Mystery, the Morality—each marks a step in the intellectual developement of the mediaeval populace. The first was pure realism, the next symbolical, the third didactic. But, by the time mediæval audiences were ready for the didactic, they were sufficiently able to realize that they did not care as much for the Biblical episodes the priests were trying to teach them as they did for the Devil and the Vice, Clown and Pantaloone, who pummelled each other with laths or clubs, and made sport quite of the kind they best enjoyed. The audiences still came to gape at the moralities, but the intervals or interludes, in which the Devil and the Vice had the stage to themselves, were the parts they most preferred. So it was not long again before the actors saw where they could earn pence by cutting lose from clerical employment, and going around playing these same Devil and Vice parts; which, from the prevailing poverty of nomenclature, soon became known as "Interludes"—and meant anything. Dumb show, pantomime, songs, dances, boxing, sparring, or whatever came handiest, horse-play mostly, but for a long time, merely dumb show with improvised ejaculation or dialogue. A step further, and the horse-play was sketched, sufficient dialogue for its development written out, and the improvisitation regulated by such stage directions as "Here they all talke," "Here they talke and rayle what they list," and the like. As they strolled from village to village, these actors put up their stages in barns now and then. But they were mostly made welcome in the Inn Yards, on two sides of which the way-side hostellries were built, the other two being enclosed with walls.

Habit survives necessity. The first settlers of North America, with unlimited areas to build in, and sunlight free, still followed the models with which they were familiar, and so built their houses with overhanging stories and small and clustering windows like the houses in the crowded city streets they had left. Just so these actors, having played so long in Inn Yards, built their permanent theatres to resemble as nearly as possible an Inn Yard. They had erected their stage with its rear to the entrance ; there was nothing specific about this stage itself, any raised platform answered. When the Miracle Plays, Mysteries, and Moralities had been exhibited in the public places and cities, the platform had been as high as the heads of the audience, and a vallence of curtains falling from around it had made the attiring, or 'tiring, room for the actors. For the Interludes this was not repeated, the actors as a rule wearing their ordinary costume, not needing one, or, if they did, they robed and unrobed in the stables or anywhere among the audience. The common run of spectators passed in and around this stage and stood in front of it. The better class looked on from the Inn windows, offices, or gallery. This was repeated in the pit. For the rest—the Inn offices suggested the parterre, and the Inn galleries the best seats. (To-day, we have actually added nothing to this arrangement, except to repeat the galleries one above another, and to add Foyers and Lobbies). And so it was but natural that the actor should retain, and retain for many years, the dumb show which had stood him and his in such good stead for Miracles, Mysteries, and Moralities not only, but for the Interludes from which in his strolling days, his livelihood had come. The performance of the Inn Yard had taken place by daylight, so by daylight still did the actor perform in his fixed theatres. The Inn Yard had no roof, so the theatre must only have a rim of thatch over the galleries. The band of musicians was then perched on a scaffolding ("scaffoldage" Shakespeare calls it in *Troilus and Cressida*) which brought them to about where the second right-hand proscenium box would come in a modern theatre—and the play-house was complete. The strolling companies had been few in numbers,

for the law was brutal in its ignorance, and three men together could be legally construed into "a Riot" by any hostile beadle or bum-bailiff. So necessity speedily instructed the actors, who had travelled in small groups, in the device of "doubling" their parts. This again was kept up in permanent city theatres. (The twenty-seven or more characters called for by the old tragedy of *Cambises* were done by seven men and a boy; and in *Henry V.* fifteen men and four boys represented the forty-five speaking parts perfectly well.) Instead of employing call-boys, great placards of pasteboard were hung on the prompter's side of the house, on the walls of the attiring-room; ruled into rectangular spaces, each representing a scene, and in these rectangles the names of all the actors required by the particular scene were written. These placards were called "Plots" or "Plats" (it is uncertain which), and were about 20 by 16 inches, written very coarsely, so as to be easily read; opposite each rectangle was any such stage direction, as "music," "tucket," "alarum," etc. The stage directions in written plays were for a long time very inartistic, and were suggested by the speeches. Thus, in the Quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost*, where Berowne, on hearing the news of the King's death, says: "Worthies retire"—the stage direction reads: *Exeunt wortheyes!* as in another where the character says: "Go to the devil!" the stage direction reads: *They go.*

The very early introduction of trap-doors has been noticed. They can be traced in stage directions certainly to thirty-two years before the *Macbeth*, with its stage direction, "*the cauldron rises.*" But the days when, to represent changes of scene, placards, with "Africa," "Vienna," "Paris," "Padua," etc., written upon them, were displayed, must have been about over when Shakespeare began his career. The realism which began to wheel in a four-post bedstead to make a bedroom scene; a draped chair to make a throne-room or imperial or regal court; a table with tankards and bottles to represent an Inn; though not far removed from Mr. Crummle's pump and washtub, certainly would have demanded the retirement of these placards.

My own impression from reading the Shakespearian plays is that this information was left to be gathered from the actors' lips. For instance, a stage direction in Greene's *Looking Glass for London* (1594) directs that "the magi with their rods beat the ground and from under the same arises a brave arbour;" the "brave arbour"—since this was even before Inigo Jones began to devise this sort of thing for the court masques—must have had some speech from the stage to assist it, even if the audience were not asked to wholly concede it. Between the trap-door and 'tiring-room (that is a green room under the stage which served for a general dressing-room for all the actors) we can imagine the constant demand for ditches, caves, caverns, etc., made by the stage directions of the period as satisfied. Any precision of *exits*, *entrances*, and *withouts* was of course the result of improvements in Theatre building, rather than in mere stage expedients.

By far the most useful thing in the Elizabethan and early Jacobean stage was the overhanging gallery, to which one and sometimes two ladders led from the floor of the stage, with curtains falling from its floor to the floor of the stage. This curtain was invaluable for a tent (which always suggested a battlefield), an inner room, a back street or alley-way, a closet or hiding-place, etc. But most important and invaluable of all was the gallery itself. It was not only Juliet's balcony, and Brabantio's and Shylock's and Montague's and Capulet's house, but it was in turn the turrets, towers, and walls from which the actors in Shakespeare's histories were continually speaking. It was used for the deck of a ship in *Caesar and Pompey* (1591) and in Ben Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass* it represented two windows to adjoining houses, outside of which two of the characters lean and converse. It supplied the ramparts at Harfleur, which Henry V. stormed, and his address: "Once more unto the breach, dear friends," he probably delivered with one foot on a rung of the ladder which reached this gallery from the stage itself. It was Antony's rostrum, of course, and upon it the mimic interplays in *Hamlet* and *Midsummer Night's Dream* were presented. Rude models of the bodies of horses,

made of canvas stretched over wooden hoops, the legs being of laths and adjustable thereto, were introduced as early as 1597. At least in a ms. play of *Richard II.* of that date, there is the stage direction "*Enter a spruce courtier a-horse-back.*" And in a list of theatrical properties dating from 1599 is entered "*One great horse with his leages;*" and there were cardboard dragons in plenty when wanted. But these horses were not easily managed, and it became a specialty of certain actors to do the horse-mounted parts. (In the ms. of Reading Corporation is an entry "*Payed Mr. Maior that he gave to the Princes hoby horse plaiores, ij. s.: vj. d.*") In a private letter of about 1605 the writer narrates having seen a play on a stage which had "a false wall faire painted and adorned with stately pillars, which pillars would turn about; by reason whereof, and with the help of painted clothes, the stage did vary three times in one tragedy," which date fixes about the first period of the innovation. The list of properties just given, of course, were exclusive of fire-arms as well as of swords and spears, which seem never to have been used except behind or below the stage, to sound "*alarums*" with (and no doubt cautiously, after one of them set had the Globe Theatre on fire).

In "*The Lamentable Tragedie, concerning the Life of Cambyses, King of Percia,*" written about 1561, we find a stage direction: *Here smite him in the neck with a sword to signify death* (evidently not the sword of lath with which the Vice of the old Miracle Play used to belabor the Devil). Nothing, however, not even the appeals of the Chorus in *Henry V.*, can better illustrate the lack of scenic effect than the following stage direction taken from *Selimus, Emperour of the Turks* (1594), "*Suppose the Temple of Mahomet.*" In Greene's *Pinner of Wakefield* (1599) one of the characters strikes one *Jenkin*, who thereupon challenges him to a duel, allowing him to choose the place. The challenged party demands: "Will you come to the town's end?" to which *Jenkin* replies: "Aye, sir; come," and in the very next line adds: "Now we are at the town's end, what say you now?" A couple of steps across the stage evidently having brought them, repre-

sentatively, to the town's end; which, as we have said, informs us how the several scenes in Act II. of *Titus Andronicus*, all requiring different portions of the forest—the hunting scene, the encounter between Lavinia and Tamora, the burying of the gold, the ravishment of Lavinia, etc.—were managed, simply by stepping to different parts of the stage. Occasionally we have a piece of realism called for in the Quartos which the better experience of the reviser for the Quartos rejected. For example, in the *Troublesome Raine of John, King of England* (which if not Shakespeare's work, he certainly follows scene for scene in his acknowledged *King John*), John says: "Why casts thou up thy eyes to heaven so?" and then we have a stage direction: "*There the five moons appear;*" and Bastard says: "See, my lord, strange apparitions," which certainly calls for some sort of scenic contrivance, unless the audience was expected to imagine them from the speaker's continuing:

"Glancing mine eye to see the diadem
Place by the bishops on your highness's head
From forth a gloomie cloud which like a curtain
Displayed itself, I sodainley espied
Five moons appearing."

Whereupon the Prophet, Peter of Pomfret, is asked to

"Decide in cyphering what these five moons
Portend this clyme," . . .

and Peter tells it off glibly off to mean that the five moons are Spain, Denmarke, Germanie, France, and Albion, the sky being Rome; the roving character of the smallest moon, Albion, betokening that John was to be degraded and dethroned because of his uneasiness at England's submission to the Pope. Of course the stage effect; raising on poles (for there were no bridges from which to suspend) of five discs to represent moons, would be easily enough accomplished. But anything is always easy enough when it once occurs to anybody to do it. The difficulty is to think of it first. Possibly we will be on the safe side if we imagine the stage direction to be a guide rather to the actor who played Bastard to raise his eyes on delivering the

speech above quoted, than to the stage artist. The fact that in the 1623 play all this "business" was left out, and the whole dismissed in Hubert's speech :

" My lord, they say five moons were seen to-night,"

and the king's exclamation : " Five moons ! " may be, perhaps, taken as an attempt at stage, as well as literary, improvement. The five moons may have worked badly, or made what was intended to be an episode of solemn portent into a grotesque spectacle. At any rate, it is the only instance I have met with where an earlier play called for more scenic effect than a later one. But the poverty of stage effect continues : In *Romeo and Juliet*, the Quartos and Folios have a stage direction, " *Enter Romeo, Mercutio, Benuilio, with five or six other maskers, torch-bearers;*" while the very next one reads : " *They march about the stage, and serving-men come forth with napkins.*" Now, of course, this first direction requires a street, while the second implies an apartment in Capulet's house; and the first correctors of the " business " so adjusted it. But nothing of any such change of stage effect is hinted at until modern times. As to ghosts, apparitions, spirits, etc., they were usually managed by recurrence to the old " dumb show," of which we have spoken as a survival from the Miracle Play. Banquo's ghost, however, rose from his place at the banqueting-table, and (unless it was done as Mr. Booth has so effectively rendered it, by addressing empty space and trusting to his audience's imagination for their horror) it is hard to find how the stage-setter contrived it. Of course, Hamlet's father's ghost was a man in armor, and Cæsar's a man in cerements ; but, later on, death could be represented effectively. At least we find stage directions in *The Duchess of Malfi* (1623) : " *Here is discovered behind a traverse, the artificial figures of Antonio and his children appearing as if they were dead.*"

In the oldest plays there is a confusion of text and stage directions, the latter sometimes directing or hinting at the speech the actor should make. In the Quarto *Loves Labour's Lost* we have an example of this. The last line is spoken by Armado :

"The voice of Mercury is harsh after the songs of Apollo." But the Folio makes him add: "You this way, I that way," probably an aside to an actor who had mistaken his exit. Some of these are very curious. In *The Troublesome Raine* we have: "*Enter the nobles and crowne King John, and then crie, God Save the King.*" And sometimes the stage direction gives the actors a hint only as to what they shall say, as (*Troublesome Raine*): "*Enter Philip leading a Frier, charging him to show where the Abbot's gold lay.*" In the blackletter Quarto of 1598 of "The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth, containing the Honourable Battell of Agin-court," the stage descriptions are of the crudest. We have: *Speaks to himself*, and, half a page further on: *She goes aside and speakes as followeth*, instead of *aside*. *He goith*, instead of *exit* (in one instance). *He weeps*, instead of *weeps*. *The king dieth*, instead of *dies*. *Enter knights raunging*. *He delivereth a ton of tennis balls*. *She beateth him*. "*Strike, Drummer. The Frenchmen crie within, S. Dennis, S. Dennis, Mount Foy, S. Dennis. The Battell. Enter King of England and His Lords.*" "*Enters Dericke roming. After him a Frenchman and takes him prisoner.*" "*Here the Frenchman laies down his sword, and the clowne takes it vp and hurles him downe.*" "*Here, while he turnes his backe, the Frenchman runnes his wayes.*" "*Enters Dericke with his girdle full of shooes.*" "*Enters Iohn Cobbler roning, with a packe full of apparell.*"

So far, at least, we are able to conjecture what would have been the properties used to play *Titus Andronicus*, and can imagine how large a part the action of a smite on the neck with a sword, "to signify death," must have been of the whole. But some of these stage directions require a little further light. We have "*Enter Lavinia ravished*" in Act II., and possibly might conclude that the actor was content to satisfy this business with a generally dishevelled appearance and make-up, were it not that flowing and dishevelled hair was stage language for virginity at that period. But the audiences at this date were not apt to be squeamish, and stood realism quite as stoutly as

it has ever been clamored for since. The priests who engineered the Miracle plays had stopped at nothing in their conviction that Bible scenes might be given to the people in the most realistic doses. The libretto and stage directions of at least one of these Coventry mysteries, *The Woman Taken in Adultery*, would scarcely be admitted to these pages. One of the least offensive of these directions may perhaps be quoted, but it is best to quote it in its original dog-Latin. It runs: "*Hic juvenis quidam extra currit in diploide, caligis non ligatis et bracas in manu tenens, et dicit accusator.*" And in the Mystery or Morality of *Mary Magdalene* (one of the Digby Mysteries), in order to emphasize the blissfulness of her later state, the priestly authors considered it necessary to delineate the young lady's original lapse from the path of exact moral rectitude, in a scene which, judging from the stage directions, was certainly not the least spirited and realistic of the piece. (But this was certainly no worse than what the modern stage has done in the last realistic renaissance. In Paris in 1873 there was played a piece called *Susanna and the Elders*, concerning which a morning newspaper gravely announced: "*Ce soir, si la police ne prenient pas, Suzanne ne fira point d'opposition a l'acte de seduction;*" and there was nothing in a certain scene in Sardou's *La Tosca* lacking to bring it up, if not to the level of a Miracle play, at least to the ravishment act in *Titus Andronicus*. And if priests had paused at nothing less than reality, why should profane players have been contented with mere verisimilitude? A ballad written to lampoon Marlowe recites that

"He had also a player been,
Upon the *Curtain* stage,
But broke his leg in one lewd scene
When in his early age."

From which we need not hesitate to conclude that the ravishment scene between Chiron, Demetrius, and Lavinia, in the play we are considering, was done without overmuch delicacy or prudery. For the rest of the play, at any rate, Lavinia's lost hands and tongue could have been done not so very repulsively by a bandage or two and a little carmine. The burial scene in

the first act, the hiding of the gold, and the pit into which Titus's sons are tumbled, were, of course, effected by using the trap. As to the business which accompanied, the passage V., ii., 180:

"This one hand yet is left to cut your throats,
Whilst that Lavinia 'tween her stumps doth hold
The basin that receives your guilty blood,"

the stage direction, *run around* or *struggle*, must be implied, as, doubtless the attempt to act two able-bodied young men standing up in a row to have their throats cut by a one-armed old man, while a girl holds up a basin under the chin of each during the operation (which is precisely the action the text calls for), would have been hooted off the stage by the extremely particular, even if not especially orderly, audiences we are soon to get a glimpse of. Equally we must presume a little dumb show or pantomime, not hinted at in either text or stage directions, for the pie that was made of the ground-up bones of Chiron and Demetrius. Perhaps a basin covered with canvas was borne in by Titus Andronicus "dressed as a cook," with his one hand and stump (which stump later on does not seem to have troubled him, when he came to the stage directions, fifteen lines apart: "*Killing Lavinia*," "*killing Tamora*.") I suppose the business, two lines further down, which directs Saturnius to kill Titus, or, at the space of two lines more, Lucius to kill Saturnius, to assume that everybody in this play carried a sword, and the direction: "*A great tumult. The people in confusion disperse. Marcus, Lucius, and their partisans go up into the balcony*," to signify that this "pavilion" scene required the full depth of the stage, so that the balcony above described could be used, and the curtains be rolled up. In Scene ii. of Act. V., line 9, we have "*Titus opens his study door*," having first read: "*Rome before Titus's house*." In Scene i. of Act IV. is a realistic piece of acting which well merits attention. (It could not have been better done to-day.) Titus, Marcus, and young Lucius have entered; and Lavinia, tongueless and handless, rushes in after them. She tries in dumb show to aid them in conjecturing who has assaulted and mutilated her. Young Lucius, it seems, on enter-

ing, has a parcel of books under his arm, out of which he has been pursuing his studies in Roman literature. He drops these books and cries to Titus for help, fearing that his aunt Lavinia means him some evil. But Titus tells him that she loves him too well to do him harm. Meanwhile Lavinia turns over the books and lifts them one by one between her stumps. This Marcus says he thinks "means that there was more than one confederate in the act." Lavinia, satisfied with this interpretation of her pantomime, drops all but one book, which she tosses up and down. Titus asks Lucius what book this is, and Lucius says: "Grandsire, it is Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." Lavinia then stops tossing the book and begins turning the leaves with her stumps and finds:

"The tragic tale of Philomel
Which treats of Tereus' treason and his rape."

Of course, all now understand that Lavinia would tell of the assault upon her, whereupon Marcus (we quote stage directions) "*writes his name*" (in the dust) "*with his staff, and guides it with feet and mouth*," saying: "I have writ my name without the help of any hand at all." Lavinia thereupon is quick to see the point, and, on being handed the staff, "*takes*" it "*in her mouth and guides it with her stumps and writes*:" "Stuprum, Chiron, Demetrius;" and so the painful story, which has already been partly acted and partly told in Scene iii. of Act II. with such horrible minuteness under the repulsive supervision of Tamora, is revealed to Lavinia's father, brother, and nephew. That Titus should, after all, kill Lavinia is, of course, a touch of Virginius, and Titus so states the precedent on accomplishing the act.

In Scene ii. ("*a forest. Horns and cry of hounds heard. Horns wind a peal*"), of course, the pit in which Aaron hides his gold, and into which he leads Quintus and Martius, is the trap of which we have spoken. When Titus goes mad and shoots off arrows, with letters tied to them, at his enemies, one of which contains the singularly inapposite quotation from Horace: "*Integer vitae*," etc.; when (V., i., 51) a ladder is brought in and held for Araon (with a black baby in his arms)

to ascend in order to be hung (though the text seems to forget all about it, and Aaron lives to be buried alive in the last scene); and when (IV., iv., 75) a clown brings in two pigeons in a basket (IV., ii., 20); when (III., i., 232) "*Enter a messenger with two heads and a hand*" (that is, carrying these members), as well as when Titus with his one hand cuts the throats of Chiron and Demetrius (who do not appear to resist the operation, but obey Titus's order to "prepare their throats" with acquiescence not to say alacrity, while Lavinia catches the blood in her basin), we may well imagine that the acting of young Shakespeare's first dramatic effort (in view of the general massacre and carnage, it does not seem a mixing of metaphor to call it "fleshing his maiden sword") made a considerable draft upon the property man of the theatre.

APPLETON MORGAN.

(*To be concluded.*)

A STUDY IN "MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING."

II.

THE STATUTE OF JAMES.



HE Folio editors have in some instances altered passages in which occur the name of God; * in others they have omitted them altogether.† One of the latter occurs in this play, Bankside lines, 1919-1922, Quarto.

* "One reformation indeed there seems to have been made, and that very laudable: I mean the substitution of more general terms for a name too often unnecessarily invoked on the stage; . . . and their caution against profaneness is, in my opinion, the only thing for which we are indebted to the judgment of the Folio editors."—Steevens.

"I doubt whether we are so much indebted to the *judgment* of the editors of the Folio edition for their caution against profaneness as to the Statute 3 Jac. I., c. 21, which prohibits, under severe penalties, the use of the sacred name in any plays or interludes. This occasioned the playhouse copies to be altered, and they printed from the playhouse copies."—Blackstone, quoted by Malone. Edition 1821, Vol. I., p. 112.

† Confer Walker's "Examination of the Text of Shakespeare," Vol. I., pp. 213-218; Cambridge Edition, 1863, Vol. I., pref., p. xx.

"*Both.* Yea, sir, we hope.

"*Kem.* Write downe, that they hope they serve God: and write God first, for God defend but God shoulde goe before such villaines."

Referring to these lines, Blackstone writes :

"The omission of this passage since the Edition of 1600 may be accounted for from the Stat. 3 James I., c. 21, the sacred name being jestingly used four times in one line." *

The statute referred to by the great jurist is important, not only for its immediate effect on the drama ; but also, as indicating the nature of the struggle then being waged for the suppression of the theatre. It is as follows :

CHAP. XXI.

"AN ACT to restrain the abuses of players."

"The penalty of players on the stage, etc., prophanely abusing the Name of God.

"For the preventing and Avoiding of the great Abuse of the Holy Name of God in Stage-plays, Enterludes, May games, Shews, and such like ; Be it enacted by our Sovereign Lord the King's Majesty, and by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the Same, That if at any Time or Times, after the End of this present Session of Parliament, any Person or Persons do or shall in any Stage-play, Enterlude, Shew, May-game, or Pageant, jestingly or profanely speak or use the Holy Name of God, or of Christ Jesus, or of the Holy Ghost, or of the Trinity, which are not to be spoken but with Fear and Reverence, shall forfeit for every such offence by him or them committed Ten Pounds : the One Moiety thereof to the King's Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, the other Moiety thereof to him or them that will Sue for the same in any Court of Record at Westminster, wherein no Essoin, Protection, or Wager of Law shall be allowed." †

Malone quotes the opinion of Blackstone approvingly.‡ From

* Blackstone was fond of annotating Shakespeare. Vide "Corrections of Shakespeare's Text by Sir Wm. Blackstone, etc."—Shakespeare Society Papers, 1844, Art. xxii., p. 96, seq.

† "The Statutes at Large, Vol. III., 1604-1698, 1 James I., to 10 William III." Official Copy in Astor Library. (Cited as 3 Jac. I. cap. 21.)

‡ Edition 1821, Vol. VII., p. 128.

it no one, I think, will dissent. While it is undoubtedly correct, there is one fact which, so far as I know, has not heretofore been noted. *The name of God, Lord, as referring to the Deity,* occurs in the Quarto sixty-six times. The Folio follows the Quarto exactly in sixty-two places. It omits the sacred name in but FOUR instances, and these all occur in the passage under consideration.* The statute of James would apply equally to the use of the name in any of the sixty-two places where it appears in the Folio. In them, as much as in this passage, is the name of God "jestingly or profanely" spoken. Why, then, should it be omitted in these four cases, in order to avoid a violation of this statute, and printed in sixty-two places where the statute would be equally transgressed?

This statute was passed at the instigation of the Puritans. Their opposition to the theatre was, at this time, relentless and powerful. James, although he favored the theatre and hated the Puritans, thought it advisable to yield somewhat to them. Hence this law. But it was not strictly enforced. The Master of the Revels, probably by his direction, certainly with his approval, did not insist on a rigid compliance with it.†

Shakespeare's company at this time had a license from the king empowering them to act in any part of the kingdom. In this they were denominated "our servants." They thus became, and were afterwards known as, "The King's Players." His Majesty, therefore, would be likely to guard them against adverse legislation.

* The name occurs three times when not referring to the Deity :

Quarto 1063. "O God of Love."

" 1206. "My Lord & brother."

" 2330. "The God of love."

"They (players) were relieved from some of the vexatious control they had experienced, and subjected only to the gentle sway of the Master of the Revels. It was his duty to revise all dramatic works before they were represented, to exclude profane and unbecoming language, and specially to take care that there should be no interference with matters of state. The former of these functions must have been rather laxly exercised; but there are instances in which a license was refused on account of very recent history being touched on in a play."—Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, Vol. III., p. 557. John Murray.

In addition, Shakespeare was on intimate terms with some of the most powerful men at court. The authorities, in whose hands lay the power to execute this law, were probably friends of the Globe Theatre Company. While, therefore, the Master of the Revels did not enforce this law strictly and expurgate the name of God every time it appeared in the play, he could not, out of regard to the Puritan opposition, entirely ignore it.* Hence, he omitted the name of God but four times out of sixty-six. Thus, like the "juggling flends" in *Macbeth*, he "paltered" with the Puritans, keeping the letter of the law, although to a very limited extent, but violating its spirit.

This suggests the important subject of *the Puritan opposition to the theatre*, to a critical study of which the remainder of this introduction will be devoted.

III.

THE PURITAN OPPOSITION TO THE THEATRE.

The first Act of Parliament for the control and regulation of the stage was passed in 1543. It was 34 and 35 Henry VIII., C. 1. It orders that no person shall "play in interludes, sing, or rhyme any matter" contrary to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. A proviso was added in favor of "songs, plays, and interludes," which have for their object "the rebuking and reproaching of vices, and the setting forth of virtue, and . . . meddle not with the interpretations of Scripture."†

This was not against theatrical performances in general. It simply aimed to protect the national religion, at that time the Roman Catholic, from assault. This was so evident that it awakened alarm among the Puritans. Their feelings were voiced by Edward Stalbridge, who printed a letter (not pub-

* Prynne, referring to the Statute of James, writes: ". . . which is seldom or never put in execution, because few else but such who delight in blasphemy, and therefore are unlikely to prove informers against it, resort to stage-playes."—"Histrio-Mastix," Part I., p. 109.

† Confer Collier's "Annals of the Stage," Vol. I., p. 128 seq. Fitzgerald's "History of the English Stage," Vol. I., p. 34 seq.

lished in England, as that would have been dangerous), dated Basle, entitled, "The Epistle Exhortatory of an English Christian to his dearly beloved Country."

Referring to this statute, he writes, "So long as they played lyes, and sange baudy songes, blasphemed God, and corrupted men's consciences, ye never blamed them. . . . But sens they persuaded the people to worship theyr Lorde God aryght, according to hys holie lawes, and not yours seq," you have enacted this law.

The Corporation of London about the same time began their efforts to suppress the theatre. They objected to it, however, on different grounds. They believed it caused disturbances, corrupted manners, and was inimical to the good of the people. Previous to April, 1543, they adopted regulations for its total suppression within the City of London. Certain players belonging to the Lord Warden ignored this, and as a consequence were imprisoned, as the following record will show :

"ST. JAMES, 10th April, 1543.

"Certayn Players belonging to the Lord Warden, for playing contrarye to an order taken by the Mayor on that behalf, were committed to the Counter."

From this time till the theatres were closed in 1647, there was, almost without cessation, a conflict on this subject between the Government on the one hand, and the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London on the other. The latter made persistent efforts to keep plays and players out of the city. The former protected and encouraged them by every means in their power.

The Statute of Henry was repealed by 1 Edward VI., C. 12., and a proclamation was issued in the 3d year of Edward VI., (1549) forbidding

"any kynde of Interlude, Plaie, Dialogue, or other matter set furthe in forme of Plaie in any place publique or private within this realme seq."

The reason given in the proclamation for its issuance is that these Interludes, Plaies, etc., "contain matter tendyng to sedi-

cion and contempnyng of sundery good orders and lawes seq."*

The legislation up to this time had applied only to those players who were not attached to the households of special noblemen. Many of the nobility had their own players, to whom they gave their personal patronage and protection. In June, 1551, the Privy Council issued an order prohibiting all such to act without a special permit. These restrictions were shortly after very much relaxed. As a consequence, the natural reaction came, and greater license, both on the part of players, and printers of plays, followed. This caused a proclamation to be issued in April, 1552, "for the reformation of vagabondes, tellers of newes, sowers of sedicious rumours, players, and printers without license," forbidding any one to play, or to print a play, without special permit from the Privy Council, under heavy punishment.† The cause of this action was not religious, but purely political.

Mary ascended the throne in July, 1553, and the following month issued "A Proclamation for reformation of busy medlers in matters of Religion, and for redresse of Prechars, Pryntars, and players." This stopped all public exhibition of plays, for two years. Up to this time and during these two years servants in households, and players attached to great noblemen, acted privately. The Star Chamber, Easter Term, 1556, issued strict orders to justices in every shire to repress even these plays.

The Privy Council, this same year, commanded Lord Rich to put "a stop to a certain stage-play about to be played in Essex." It also ordered the servants of Sir Thomas Leek to be arrested and prevented from playing.‡

WM. H. FLEMING.

(To be continued.)

* Vide "Collection of such proclamations as have been sette furthe by the Kynge's Majestie." Printed by Richard Grafton, 1550.

† "We find an order from the Privy Council for the release of a poet, 'which is in the Tower for making plays.'—Fitzgerald's "History, etc.," Vol. I., p. 35.

‡ Confer Fitzgerald's "History, etc.," Vol. I., p. 36.

SHAKESPEARIAN MUSIC.

I HAVE perused with much interest the articles in the October and December numbers of SHAKESPEARIANA on dramatic music to Shakespeare, etc. I venture to suggest the following additions to the lists there given :

ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA.

Kafka's opera, *Antoine et Cleopatre*, was produced at Berlin, in 1780, not at Breslau, 1781.

ADDITIONS.

Kleopatra, opera in four acts, by Wilhelm Freudenberg, produced at Magdeburg in 1882.

Antonius und Kleopatra, grand opera, by Fürsten von Wittgenstein, produced at Graz, 1883.

AS YOU LIKE IT.

Tausch, incidental music to *As You Like It*, was produced at Düsseldorf in 1859.

ADDITIONS.

Viola, opera, by Richard Heuberger.

Cesario, opera, by Steinkühler, Düsseldorf, 1848.

Cesario, opera, by Taubert, ——, 1874.

CURIOLANUS.

Coriolano, opera, by Cavalli, produced at Wien in 1717, not at Parma in 1660.

Coriolano, opera, by Niccolini, produced at Mailand in 1809, not in 1810.

Coriolanus, overture by Beethoven, produced at Wien in 1807.

ADDITIONS.

Coriolan, incidental music by F. L. Seidel, produced at Berlin, 1811.

Coriolano, opera, by Graun, Berlin, 1749.

Coriolano, opera, by Lavigna, Parma, 1806.

HAMLET.

Stadtfeldt's *Hamlet*, produced at Brussel, 1857, not at Darmstadt.

ADDITIONS.

Music to *Hamlet*, by Mangold, Darmstadt.

Music to *Hamlet*, by Miltitz.

Music to *Hamlet*, by Hirschbach.

Overture to *Hamlet*, by Bischoff.

Overture to *Hamlet*, by Joachim.

Overture to *Hamlet*, by Emanuel Bach.

Hamlet, Symphonic Poem, by Liszt.

Hamlet, March and Chorus, by Berlioz.

Hamlet, opera, by Mareczek, Brünn, 1841 (not 1843).

HENRY VIII.

Henry VIII., opera, with Ballet, by Saint-Saens.

JULIUS CÆSAR.

Schumann's Overture, Düsseldorf, 1852.

Music to *Julius Cæsar*, by Henning, Berlin, 1830.

Overture to *Julius Cæsar*, by Hirschbach.

Overture to *Julius Cæsar*, by Falchi.

Julius Cæsar, by Keiser.

Guilio Casare, opera, by Händel, London, 1724.

Guilio Casare, by Perez, etc., is correct.

Julius Cæsar, opera, by Carlo (pseud.).

KING JOHN.

Music to *King John*, by Schneider, Berlin, 1823.

Overture to *King John*, by Radecke, Berlin, 1859.

KING LEAR.

Music to *King Lear*, by André, Berlin, 1778 (not 1780).

Music to *King Lear*, by Blumenthal, Wien, 1829.

Overture to *King Lear*, by Leidgebel, Berlin, 1851.

Overture to *King Lear*, by Balakirew, Dessau, 1865.

MACBETH.

Music to *Macbeth*, by André, Berlin, 1778 (not 1780).

Music to *Macbeth*, by Reichardt, Berlin, 1787.

Music to *Macbeth*, by Seidel, Berlin, 1809.
Music to *Macbeth*, by Weyse.
Music to *Macbeth*, by Mangold, Darmstadt, 1830.
Music to *Macbeth*, by Rastrelli, Dresden, 1836.
Music to *Macbeth*, by Heinefetter, Dessau, 1870.
Overture to *Macbeth*, by Eberwein, Rudolstadt, 1828.
Overture to *Macbeth*, by Pearsall (composed in 1836).
Overture to *Macbeth*, by Skeletti.
Overture to *Macbeth*, by Raff (mss.)
Macbeth, Symphonic Poem, by Pierson, supposed to have been composed in 1870.
Macbeth, opera, by Chélard, Paris, 1827.

MERCHANT OF VENICE.

Music to *Merchant of Venice*, by Mangold.
Music to *Merchant of Venice*, by Mühlendorfer.
Overture to *Merchant of Venice*, by Titl, Amsterdam.
Merchant of Venice, opera, by Piusuti, Bologna, 1873.
Music to *Merchant of Venice*, by Sullivan, Manchester, 1873.

MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR.

Overture to *Merry Wives of Windsor*, by Titl.
Overture to *Merry Wives of Windsor*, by Damcke, Potsdam, 1841.
Merry Wives of Windsor, opera, by Ritter, Mannheim, 1794.
Merry Wives of Windsor, comic opera, by Dittersdorf.

There is a manuscript Overture to *Henry IV.*, by Joachim. (Grove, 2: 35.)

My authority for the preceding corrections and additions is, for the most part, A. Schaefer's Historisches und systematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke zu den Dramen Schillers, Goethes, Shakespeares, Kleists und Körners. Leipzig: Karl Merseburger, 1886.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

The Open Court.

Circular Letter.

FROM MRS. HENRY POTT, 81 CORNWALL GARDENS,
QUEEN'S GATE, S. W.

SIR : Permit me to draw your attention to some facts which have recently come under my notice with regard to the original edition of the collected "Shakespeare" plays, known as the First Folio of 1623. In the spring of 1888, when Mr. Donnelly was in this country, he received from Mr. James Cary, of New York, some papers explanatory of a discovery claimed to have been made by that gentleman of certain wheel-ciphers in the original folio of "Shakespeare." These ciphers are various, but one chief system depends upon certain marks and dots which Mr. Cary indicated, as being placed over, or under, or between certain letters and figures, or before the names of the characters. These peculiar and suspicious markings the cryptographer had been led to observe whilst endeavoring to find the desired clue to the arrangement of words in the great cryptogram. Mr. Donnelly compared Mr. Cary's descriptions with his own "Staunton" *fac-simile*, but he could not find such marks as Mr. Cary pointed out, consequently he could make nothing of the wheel-ciphers submitted to him, and this he reported to Mr. Cary. It so happened that I had to a great extent tabulated the so-called "printer's errors," and "accidents," and "misprints" of the First Folio, as shown in the reduced *fac-simile*; and for which the late Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps wrote a preface. When, therefore, Mr. Donnelly showed me Mr. Cary's work, I recognized many of the indications given, and we saw at once that with regard to certain particulars, there were undoubtedly discrepancies between this Halliwell-Phillipps *fac simile* and many of the original copies of the 1623 folio, to be found in the great libraries of England and America. At that time Mr. Donnelly was disinclined to enter into a totally new line of research, and one which required almost microscopic

minuteness of investigation. Thus the correspondence with Mr. Cary passed into my hands. I soon found that the Halliwell-Phillipps *fac-similes* from which Mr. Cary and I were working differed in a vast number of particulars from other "fine" original folios which I have examined. *The differences were in all cases additions.* In other words, there were in the original folio from which our *fac-similes* were taken, a quantity of marks, neatly and distinctly made, and *some figures turned hind-side before*, which do not exist in ordinary folio copies. Since it is manifestly impossible that the photograph could represent more particulars than were contained in the thing photographed, two alternatives only suggested themselves. Either these extra marks were printed after the rest of the work (in which case there would have been two editions of 1623), or, more probably, these significant markings must have been put in with a pen, by some member of the secret society for whose information the cipher narrative was contrived.

It became necessary, then, to ascertain if these peculiarities had been noted by bookworms and close students of "Shakespeare" texts, and also, from what copy the "reduced *fac-simile*" was photographed. I wrote to the late Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps describing some of the marks in question, and asking, 1. Had he any reason to doubt that all the copies of the First Folio which had passed through his hands were absolutely and invariably identical? 2. From which copy in what library was his reduced *fac-simile* taken? In a long and courteous letter written shortly before his death, Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps replied to the first of these questions, that he had never observed any differences; to the second, that he did not know: he had never seen the copy from which the "reduced *fac-simile*" was taken.

I then wrote to the publishers, Messrs. Chatto & Windus, from whom I learnt that the *fac-simile* in question was copied by a photographic process, from an original folio bought by them of Mr. Hayes, bookseller, of Manchester, and that they believed the original to be now in the private library of Mr. Robert Roberts, of Boston, Lincolnshire. Correspondence with this

gentleman has served to establish the singular but lamentable fact that many at least of the marks plainly photographed in the *fac-simile* have since disappeared. It appears that in order satisfactorily to photograph a book it must be completely unbound, and the photographs taken sheet by sheet. For the sake of improving the appearance of the volume, the binders frequently clean or "wash" the sheets with chemicals which do not affect the printing, but which obliterate marks of writing ink. Mr. Roberts thinks it probable that some of the leaves in his copy have been thus washed. The result is as curious as disappointing, and presents us with this paradox. *The reduced fac-simile of the original, is now, in the true sense, the original copy, whilst the original copy is no longer absolutely like its own fac-simile.*

By the pernicious operation described, this precious folio has been deprived of many of the very marks which are of priceless value, interesting beyond description to the cryptographer.

It is in the hope of saving from a similar fate other marked copies of "Shakespeare," and also all marked or scribbled volumes of merit whatsoever, published during the 16th and 17th centuries, that I write this letter, the contents of which I request you to be so good as to impart to any of your friends who possess valuable old books, or who are in any way connected with the care of libraries, or with the arts or trades relating to books. I shall be greatly obliged if any one who can give accurate information concerning marked copies, their owners, or their history, will communicate with me. It is in the highest degree improbable that the folio in question, hit upon by mere chance, and without any thought of ciphers or secret societies, should be the only marked and unwashed copy extant. We may fairly hope to discover others, especially in old private libraries, where books, even if they suffer from the damp or the weevils, escape a worse fate at the hands of restorers. It seems at present undesirable to publish a detailed account of the signs by which the ciphers have been worked, lest dishonest or unscrupulous persons should be tempted to tamper with other copies. Let us hope that public interest may soon be

sufficiently aroused to encourage the industrious experts who are quietly working at this subject, to publish their results, and to secure intelligent and ungrudging help in this newly revived branch of science.

Meanwhile I am glad of this opportunity for imparting to friends in distant countries this unexpected confirmation of Mr. Donnelly's statements. This fresh evidence is documentary, and admits of ocular demonstration, making assurance doubly sure as to the existence of a great and wonderful cipher system, running through the whole of the "Shakespeare Folio of 1623," and, I believe, through a still larger group of works of the 16th and 17th centuries.

I am sir, faithfully yours,

CONSTANCE M. POTT.

Jan'y 30, 1889.

The editors of **SHAKESPEARIANA** print this extraordinary circular simply out of personal respect and esteem for Mrs. Pott. They are perfectly aware—as are most of **SHAKESPEARIANA**'s readers—that there is no "Cipher" in the First Folio Shakespeare, nor in any copy or impression thereof. But if Mrs. Pott will have it that there is—well, then, let there be a cipher there. Only, if Mrs. Pott will read her own "Promus of Formularies and Elegancies," she will learn that, whatever ciphers may exist in First Folio Shakespeares, the Donnelly "cipher narrative" is not one of them. Indeed, those two books, "The Promus" and "The Great Cryptogram," cannot exist side by side. One or the other of them must be a monstrous lie.

Reviews.

(1) **THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE QUESTION ANSWERED.** By C. Stopes. Second Edition, corrected and enlarged. London: Trübner & Co. pp. 268, cloth.

(2) **A REFUTATION OF THE HON. IGNATIUS DONNELLY'S GREAT CRYPTOGRAM.** By the Rev. A. Nicholson, LL.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin. pp. 64, paper.

(3) **BACON, SHAKESPEARE, AND THE ROSICRUCIANS.** By W. F. C. Wigston, Author of "A New Study of Shakespeare;" two plates. London: George Redway. pp. 284, cloth.

(4) **THE BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE.** Vol. III. Romeo and Juliet. With Introduction by William Reynolds, A.M., LL.D. New York: The Shakespeare Society of New York. boards, pp. 205.

(5) **PAPERS OF THE NEW YORK SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY.** I.—VIII. Including the *Digesta Shakespeariana*. paper.

(6) **THE PENTAMERON.** Citation and Examination of William Shakespeare—Minor Prose Pieces—Criticisms. cloth, pp. 419.

(7) **PEN AND INK.** Papers on subjects of more or less importance. By Brander Matthews. pp. 228, cloth.

(8) **THE HUMAN MYSTERY IN HAMLET.** An attempt to say an unsaid word. By Martin W. Cooke, A.M. pp. 135, cloth.

(9) **SHAKESPEARE'S HENRY THE FIFTH.** With an Introduction and Notes. By K. Deighton, M.A. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. pp. 233. cloth.

(10) **SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD THE THIRD.** With an Introduction and Notes. By C. H. Tawney, A.M. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. pp. 255. cloth.

(11) **STRAY LEAVES OF LITERATURE.** By Frederick Saunders. New York: Whittaker & Co. pp. 200, cloth.

(12) **SHAKESPEARIANA.** Vol. V. New York: The Leonard Scott Publication Co. pp. 581, cloth.

(13) **ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH.** A preparation for the study of English Literature. By M. W. Smith A.M., Teacher of English Literature in Hughes High School, Cincinnati. Cincinnati: Van Antwerp, Bragg & Co. cloth.

(1) We are charmed with the concentration of this volume. Of course the fields are well worn, but much that is worn in usage may be lightened and freshened by so deft a handling. The scope of the work is best indicated by the terse preface to the First Edition: "The great Shakespearean scholars have considered it beneath their dignity to answer the assertions of the Baconians. 'Silence may be golden' in regard to the character of the living, but in defence of the dead, I should think speech is golden when it answers speech, and proof when it contests proof." And accordingly the author believes that the volume here presented "may help to turn the balance in some wavering minds, or to aid Shakespeareans too busy to go to work on their own account to give a reason for the faith that is in them." A seriatim and categorical answer to the Baconians, that cannot but be of great value to collectors of Bacon-Shakespearean literature. Mrs. Stopes' especial care, and it has never been set out so rigidly and vividly, is that, whereas Shakespeare treated

men and motives from the purely psychological. Bacon considered them from the absolutely scientific, point of view: one painted from a palette, the other graved with a steel point; one used color, the other produced only line drawings. Mrs. Stopes in this opposed treatment is absolutely studious and careful—as exact as Bacon himself. A very pointed observation, but only akin to hundreds of others, is the difference in the way each of her subjects would handle the matter of intoxicants. The one moralized over their effect upon the moral sense, the actions, the deeds of men; the other wrote of the processes by which they were manufactured and the best methods of concentrating or mitigating their attributes. Mrs. Stopes is a Scotch woman, who seems to be quite as alert as her English country-woman, Mrs. Pott, in detecting root matters in the habitudes and personalities of these two men.

(2) The Rev. Dr. Nicholson also has been at pains to refute Mr. Donnelly once more by an array of figures quite equal to the great Cryptogram itself. Meanwhile Mr. Donnelly himself announces that the failure of his cipher is not due to its examination, but to the railway companies of the United States, who employed a certain railroad attorney (whom he specifies by name) to bribe the press of England and America. This would seem to throw the whole cipher business into the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inquire by what right the railway companies proceeded so *ultra vires* of their charters, unless indeed a commission *de lunatico* should take prior jurisdiction in the premises.

(3) *Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Rosicrucians* is a most remarkable book. Like its predecessor, "A New Study of Shakespeare," one cannot open it without learning something. True, this something he learns is not always important. It may only be that the shape of Francis Bacon's tomb had a mystical connection with the name of Shakespeare; that Christopher Sly was the real type of the alleged bard of Avon; that Hermia and Helena were a dual unity; that the central myth of Eleusis is incorporated in *The Winter's Tale*; that there was a lodge of Freemasons at St. Albans, etc., etc. But all the same the book is a curiosity and no Shakespeare-Bacon library should be without it. A certain John Heydon, who rewrote Bacon's "New Atlantis," under the title "Voyage to the Land of the Rosicrucians," is largely particularized, and his plagiarism used as proof that Bacon was a Rosicrucian. Well, he was almost everything else, and probably was that also. But it will not do to ask what any one item of Mr. Wigston's information has to do with any other. It is much less laborious to simply admit that it all tends to prove Bacon to have written Shakespeare.

(4) When the New York Shakespeare Society announced, in 1885, that it had determined to commence the publication of an edition of Shakespeare in twenty volumes, which should devote to the text of the great work a loving and minute care such as it had never received before—which should parallel its very earliest and very latest form, reproducing all the antique and pedantic ornaments of the Quartos and Folios, should number consecutively every line, whether speech, stage direction, exit or entrance; which should exactly copy every typographical slip, misplaced punctuation, error in orthography, or inverted letter in both texts (in order that readers might judge for themselves as to the value of conjectural readings or corrections based upon these inaccuracies)—when we say the Society resolved upon this work, it first of all determined that the work was not worth attempting unless it could be done with absolute accuracy—that anything less would make the edition merely one more

added to the hundreds of excellent reading editions, but not specific enough to engage the resources of the Society in lieu of less absorbing but still valuable labor. We think subscribers to *The Bankside Shakespeare* are satisfied so far with the Society's performance of its unique, laborious, and ambitious project. Any temptation to relax editorial industry, and to expect the sumptuous simplicity of the typography which the Riverside Press has lavished on this edition to commend it to favor, certainly has not prevailed. It is proposed that nothing in this edition should fall short of the purpose of the membership of a society which prints in every volume issued under its seal the statement that "In order that the papers printed by this Society may always be of the highest character, and of value from all standpoints, the Society does not stand pledged as responsible except in so far as it certifies by its imprimatur that it considers them as original contributions to Shakespearean study." As for typography, nothing purer or more richly elaborate has ever appeared from an American press than these Banksides, with their rubricated titles, laid paper, clear-cut letter-press, and brilliant ink. Certainly, no such loving care has ever been bestowed upon Shakespeare before. Every line, or exit, entrance or stage direction of less than a line, is numbered twice, and at intervals three times, that the reader's eye may at once identify each word and phrase in either edition, as well as trace the manipulations or variations given it by their author. That a work like the Bankside edition should have emanated from American scholars, and its critical and careful typography from an American press, are matters to be proud of. But, while the texts here thrice collated—twice by consecutive notation, and once tabulated (each Bankside line being referred to a Quarto "signature" (the quartos being unpage) and to the Folio-line, column and page)—the Introductions are intended to be the results of the personal and special (if they so elect) study of each play, and for which each member is particularly and personally responsible, the responsibility of the Society as a unit extending only to the scrupulous accuracy of the reproduced texts. Accordingly, in Volume I. Mr. Morgan confined himself to his theory that the 1623 text of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was the result of the twenty-one years' growth of the play by interpolations, "gags," and variants introduced by the various actors who in a generation of stage life had pronounced it. In Volume II. Mr. Frey devoted himself to a re-examination of Capell's old claim that *The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Taming of the Shrew* had an identical authorship; and in Volume III. *The Merchant of Venice*, now before us, Mr. Reynolds has not feared—even in the face of the childish claims of the cipherists—to grapple boldly with the Baconian Theory, and (as we think) to considerably worst it. In conclusion we have only to say that this immense work has met with nothing but encomium, and there is nothing to interfere with its splendid success: there is not an original Folio or Quarto not accessible to its editors. Its proof-reading is entrusted not only to its editors finally, but to a corps of the best professional proof-readers in the world, on the staff of the great Riverside Press, and the work will be to their credit as well as to the credit of the New York Shakespeare Society, as well as in perpetual memory of the fidelity and patience of all concerned.

(6) The first eight numbers of the publications of the New York Shakespeare Society reasonably group themselves into two volumes. Numbers 4 and 7, being the *Digesta Shakespeariana*, of course should be bound as Volume II. (and it would be convenient, we should think, to bind them in-

terleaved for augmentation), while the others would make Volume I. With No. 9 the Society has changed the size of its publications from 16mo to small square folio, which is an improvement both in convenience and in appearance, a considerably larger type is employed, which is also in the line of betterment. These publications are intended to be exclusive of criticism *per se*, and to include only matter of preservative value as for purposes of reference.

(6) Messrs. Roberts Bros. have put into its most accessible and reasonable form this English classic, and gentlemen who write cipher narratives to embalm in Seventeenth Century literature—by studying Mr. Landor's exquisite reproduction of the English of that age—can add largely to the verisimilitude of their performances.

(7) *Pen and Ink*.—Mr. Matthews is a gentleman who writes with ease and at leisure. That he has no characteristic nothing which would enable us to say of a book of his if printed anonymously: "That's Matthews; that sounds like Matthews" and that he is careful never to tread on anybody's corns—is nothing against this pleasant little book, which quite repays a reading. Mr. Matthews in writing of poker alludes to a belief that the great American game had a genesis in the *Primero* which Falstaff regretted having ceased to play when he left the court, as he says in the *Merry Wives*. We suspect that the reason why Sir John ceased to play was because he had no coin of the realm, and his friends declined longer to take his IOU's or, perhaps, like his tailor, declined to accept Bardolph as security. And as there is nobody living who ever played, or knows how to play *Primero*, Mr. Matthews certainly is not laying himself open to any risk of contradiction by making the assertion.

(8) The "unsaid word" which Mr. Cooke attempts to "say," is not after all, so unfamiliar. We cannot agree with critics who sail in the clouds or among the stars, in attempting to hunt up Shakespeare's motives in writing *Hamlet*. Why not tread the soil of this poor planet? It was the planet upon which Shakespeare lived and died, and where he earned his money, wrote his plays, built his theatres, brought his suits, had his frolics, lived, loved, married, died, as the rest of us. To our thinking Mr. Cooke's chapter on "Suggestive Parallelisms: " coincidences between *Hamlet* and some classical works," constitutes the chief value of his book.

(9) (10) Messrs. Macmillan & Co. are publishing a Series of Selections from the Works of the English Classics, with Introductions and Notes, specially written for the Use of Native Students preparing for the Examinations of the Universities of Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, and the Punjab, and announce that they "have succeeded in securing the co-operation of Professors in the several Presidency Colleges, and of other scholars whose names are well known in India, who bring to the elucidation of English texts the important qualification of familiarity with the special difficulties which present themselves to Indian students." We confess to have opened the two volumes already issued in this series with considerable curiosity, and that our curiosity has yielded to delight. Indeed there are many besides Indian pupils who may profit by such text-books as these! Listen to this: "In regard to aesthetic and psychological criticism, the danger is not in giving too little help, but too much. To an Indian student nothing is so tempting as to commit to memory whole pages of criticism, the meaning of which, in the majority of cases, is but dimly understood by him. * * * In this matter, therefore, our object is to give a plain, lucid outline of the action of the play as it affects the principal characters, avoiding anything like an exhaustive analysis of their-

motives and significance of their conduct." We cannot too highly commend a series that thus, at the outset, announces its determination to study facts, and let the "sign-post" critics fight it out among themselves.

(11) Octogenarian as he is Mr. Frederick Saunders, the beloved and honored librarian of the Astor Library, cannot cease to roam and cull among its treasures for his greater clientage outside. But nothing in Mr. Saunders' dainty little books—which begin to have a welcome periodicity of their own—is more apparent than the ever young and ever warm heart of their compiler.

(12) The value of these bound volumes of SHAKESPEARIANA increases as time goes by. The record of the last five years here preserved covers a very active period in Shakespearian matters. Among the more important papers included in the present volume is the very last memorandum the late J. O. Halliwell-Phillips ever wrote—the brief and modest sketch of his own life-work—and the admirable paper of Dr. Nathaniel Holmes, in which, while adhering to the Bacon theory, he completely ignores the possibility of a same suspension of judgment in favor of a Donneley or other "cipher." By the way, if there still remains a doubter who doubts that the first folio was set up from the quartos when procurable, let him examine the *Troilus and Cressida* and see (in Banksdale folio line 3265) where the compositor exactly copied a typographical error from the 1609 Quarto: *i.e.*, in the word *enrapt* the quarto has (Banksdale Quarto line 3061) ENTAFT, and the folio exactly follows it.

(13) Mr. Smith has devised a plan of teaching the rudiments of the English Literature and Structure based on the composite character of the language. He says: "A great deal of the work done with the English sentence in grammar and rhetoric has been to discover errors; the teaching of correct English has been therefore negative in character. Mr. Smith has attempted to reverse the process. The study of English must be fascinating when pursued with such a handbook as this. Not the least conspicuous feature of this manual is a glossary of English words in use before the year 1300 which still retain their significances.

MESSRS. SAMPSON LOW & CO. announce "A History of English Bookselling," by W. Roberts, editor of the *Bookworm*. Mr. Roberts has been engaged for many years upon the subject, and his work promises to supplement Curwen's in many important particulars, and, indeed, to a large extent going over untouched ground. There will be twelve chapters, dealing with Bookselling before Printing; The Dawn of English Bookselling; Bookselling in the Time of Shakespeare; Bookselling in the 17th Century; Bookselling on London Bridge; in Little Britain; in Paternoster Row, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Westminster Hall. There will also be biographical sketches of Jacob Tonson, Bernard Lintot, Edmund Cull, John Dunton, and Thomas Guy.

MESSRS. WILLIAM H. WARD & CO. of New York, London, and Belfast have just manufactured a stationery cabinet which they call the "Shakspeare House" Cabinet, as it is an exact representation in colors of the birth-house at Stratford-on-Avon. The cabinet is $9\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, and the roof opens to disclose an interior, being the familiar "birth-room" (so called) The box filled with choice "V.R." parchment, or Royal Irish linen paper makes a beautiful souvenir.